AC optimal power flow in the presence of renewable sources and uncertain loads

Mohammadreza Chamanbaz*, Fabrizio Dabbene†, and Constantino Lagoa‡

arXiv:1702.02967v1 [math.OC] 9 Feb 2017

Abstract

The increasing penetration of renewable energy resources, together with the fact that load can vary significantly, introduce a high degree of uncertainty in the behavior of modern power grids. Given that classical dispatch solutions are "rigid," their performance in such an uncertain environment is in general far from optimal. For this reason, in this paper, we consider AC optimal power flow (AC-OPF) problems in the presence of uncertain loads and (uncertain) renewable energy generators. The goal of AC-OPF design is to guarantee that controllable generation is dispatched at minimum cost, while satisfying constraints on generation and transmission for almost all realizations of the uncertainty.

We propose an approach based on a randomized technique recently developed, named *scenario with certificates*, which allows to tackle the problem without assuming any a-priori dependence of the voltages in the network on the uncertain generators/loads. The proposed solution can exploit the usually available probabilistic description of the uncertainty and variability, and provides solutions with a-priori probabilistic guarantees on the risk of violating the constraints on generation and transmission.

I. Introduction

Modern power grids are characterized by increasing penetration of renewable energy sources, such as solar photovoltaic and wind power. This trend is expected to increase in the near future, as also testified by strict commitments to large renewable power penetration being made by major countries worldwide. For instance, in the U.S., a Department of Energy decree [18] established a goal of 20% renewable penetration to be reached by 2030. In the European Union, according to [42], renewable energy technologies account for 62% of new power generating capacity installed in 2009. In particular, 39% of all new capacity installed in 2009 was wind power, followed by gas (25%) and solar photovoltaics (16%). Moreover, Europe decommissioned more coal, fuel oil and nuclear capacity than it installed in 2009. On February 2015, the European Commission launched a Strategic Energy Technology Plan (SET-Plan) [15], which defines the new European Research & Innovation Strategy for the coming years, and has a specific focus on renewable energy, establishing the European Wind Initiative and the Solar Europe Initiative. According to statistics released by the Global Wind Energy Council [17], in 2015 China overtook the EU for total installed wind energy capacity, by installing almost three times as much wind turbines than the EU.

While the advantages of renewable energy in terms of environmental safeguard are indisputable, its introduction does not come without a cost. Indeed, renewable energy generation technologies are highly variable and not fully dispatchable, thus imposing novel challenges to the existing power system operational paradigm. As discussed in e.g. [6], when uncontrollable resources fluctuate, classical optimal power flow (OPF) solutions can provide very inefficient power generation policies, that result in line overloads and, potentially, cascading outrages.

Despite the increasingly larger investments, which are costly and subject to several regulatory and policy limitations, the frequency and scale of power outages are steadily growing. This situation clearly shows that a strategy only based on investments in technological improvements of the transmission lines and controllable generation capacity—as those discussed e.g. in [7], [16]—is not sufficient anymore. Instead,

*Arak University of Technology, Daneshgah Street, Arak, Iran (e-mail: chamanbaz@u.nus.edu; chamanbaz.arakut@gmail.com).
†CNR-IEIIT, Politecnico di Torino, Torino, 10129, Italy (e-mail: fabrizio.dabbene@polito.it).
‡The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA (e-mail: lagoa@engr.psu.edu)

This work was supported in part by the CNR International Joint Lab COOPS, the National Science Foundation under grant CNS-1329422 and the Singapore National Research Foundation (NRF) grant under the ASPIRE project, grant No NCR-NCR001-040.

radically new dispatch philosophies need to be devised, able to cope with the increasing *uncertainty*, due to unpredictable fluctuations in renewable output and time-varying loads.

Indeed, classical OPF dispatch—employed to design generator output setpoints in order to meet demand at minimum cost, without violating operating limitations of generators and transmission lines—is typically computed based on simple predictions of expected loads and generation levels for the upcoming time window. Although these predictions can be fairly precise for the case of traditional generators and loads—thus allowing OPF to achieve remarkable reliability of operation in the presence of normal fluctuations—they may be highly unreliable in the case of renewable generators, thus explaining its failure in these latter situations. As a consequence, recent regulatory initiatives, such as Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Orders 764 [23] and 890 [22] have identified the need for a new generation of operating protocols and decision-making tools for the successful integration of renewable generation.

It follows that one of the major problems in today's power grids is the following: *Given the high level of uncertainty introduced by renewable energy sources, design a dispatch policy that i) minimizes generation costs and ii) does not violate generation and transmission constraints for all admissible values of renewable power and variable demand. In other words, one would like to design an optimal dispatch policy that is robust against uncertainty.*

Such robust policies might be very conservative. Power networks can tolerate temporary violations of their generation and transmission constraints. Moreover, being robust with respect to any possible value of the uncertainty leads to very inefficient policies, since some scenarios are very unlikely. Hence, in this paper we take a different approach. Instead of requiring that the network constraints are satisfied for all possible values of uncertainty, we allow for a small well-defined risk of constraint violation.

More precisely, we start by assuming that one can adapt the power generated based on information about current values of renewable power generation and demand. Under this assumption, we aim at minimizing cost of power generation while meeting demand and allowing a small well defined risk of violating network constraints. We re-formulate the problem by highlighting the fundamental difference between control and state variables. Then, to solve the resulting (complex) optimization problem we leverage recent results on convex relaxations of the optimal power flow problem [31], and use a novel way of addressing probabilistic robust optimization problems known as *scenario with certificates* (SwC) [24]. In this way, we derive a convex problem that i) is efficiently solvable, ii) provides a good approximation of the optimal power generation under the above mentioned risk constraints and iii) provides an exact solution for certain classes of networks.

A. Previous Results

The optimal power flow problem is known to be NP-hard even in the absence of uncertainty; see for instance the recent report [8] and references therein. Hence, several numerical approaches have been taken to provide approximations of the optimal solution of the OPF. These include Newton methods [20] and interior point based methods [38], [50]. Moreover, many heuristics have been proposed to solve this very complex problem including particle swarm optimization [1] and genetic algorithms [30].

In particular, a number of approximations have been introduced in the literature in order to recover convexity and make the problem numerically tractable. The most common one is the DC approximation ([2], see also [43], [14] for a modern revisitation of this approach), in which the AC OPF problem is linearized by introducing several simplifying restrictions regarding voltage magnitudes, voltage angles, admittances, and reactive power. Although the DC approximation leads to a tractable problem, the solution obtained using this method is in general sub-optimal and, more importantly, it may not be feasible, in the sense that it may not satisfy the original nonlinear power flow equations. In this latter situation, the network operator has to rerun the optimization modifying the constraints using some ad-hoc heuristics, with in general no a-priori guarantee of convergence. This renders this solution not suitable for large systems. Also, as noted in [14], the fact that DC approximation fixes voltage magnitudes and ignores reactive power, makes the solution not applicable in several important practical situations.

Motivated by the above considerations, semidefinite programming (SDP) relaxations of the AC OPF problem have been recently introduced to alleviate the computational burden, in [29] for radial networks and in [5] for general networks, see [33, Remark 6] for a detailed review. These convex relaxations have recently received renewed interest thanks to [31], that analyzes the optimality properties of the relaxation, showing how in many practical situation these relaxations turn out to be exact—in the sense that the solution of the relaxed problem coincides with that of the original nonlinear one. This result has sparked an interesting literature analyzing specific cases in which the SDP relaxations can be proven to be exact, see e.g. [21], and showing how graph sparsity can be exploited to simplify the SDP relaxation of OPF, see e.g. [4], [28].

However, while these works have reached a good level of maturity (see for instance the recent two-part tutorial [33], [34]), there is still very little research analyzing if and how these relaxations could be extended to the problem considered in this paper, namely AC OPF in the presence of possibly large and unpredictable uncertainties. Indeed, when it comes to robust OPF, most literature recurs to simple DC models, see e.g. [6], [35], with the drawbacks discussed before. In particular, there are recent results that use a scenario based approach to design dispatch policies, but they are also limited to the linearized DC case, see in particular the works [45], [46], [47].

Notable exceptions are [49], in which a non-convex scenario approach is provided, and [44], where the relaxation in [31] together with a strict parameterization of the dependent variables is proposed, and a scenario approach is adopted to solve the ensuing robust convex problem. Inspired by this recent work, in this paper we provide a less conservative approach, that does not require dependent variable parameterization. Instead, we exploit a recently developed approach to probabilistic robust optimization *scenario with certificates* [24] to develop less conservative, efficient relaxations of the OPF in the presence of uncertainty.

B. The Sequel

The paper is organized as follows: In Section II we precisely formulate the AC-OPF problem. We also describe the form of the dispatch policy to be used in the presence of uncertainty. Then, we introduce a reformulation of the Robust AC-OPF problem, which represents one of the main contributions of our work. Inspired by [49], the proposed formulation divides the set of optimization variables into two distinct classes:

1) *independent/control variables*, which are the ones that can be controlled by the operators; i.e., active power and voltage magnitude in the generator nodes,
2) *dependent/state variables*, which represent the state of the system. This include, for example, voltage phase in all nodes, reactive power of generators and voltage magnitude of non-generator nodes.

In Section III, we show how this reformulation can be combined with the convex relaxation of [31], and we formally prove how this allows to recover its properties in terms of exactness of the relaxation in some special cases. Moreover, this new formulation directly translates in the scenario with certificates paradigm. This is shown in Section IV, where the scenario with certificates formulation is formally recalled and the sampled optimization problem to be solved is introduced. Numerical examples illustrating the performance of the proposed approach are provided in Section V. Finally, in Section VI, some concluding remarks are presented.

II. Optimal Power Flow Allocation Problem under Uncertainty

In this section, we briefly summarize the power flow model adopted in this paper, which explicitly takes into account load uncertainties and variable generators. We also formalize the ensuing optimization problem arising from the necessity of robustly guaranteeing that safety limits are not exceeded. An electric power grid whose general configuration is depicted in Figure 1 is considered where traditional generators and loads—with highly predictable behavior—coexist with renewable energy sources and time-varying loads, characterized by high variability and uncertainty.



Fig. 1: Smart power distribution grid, comprising renewable generators and variable (uncertain) loads.

In the next subsection, we start by describing the traditional deterministic AC optimal power flow problem (AC-OPF), as originally introduced in [10], see also the survey [8] for an historical perspective. We refer to this problem as the *nominal* power flow model to highlight the fact that all involved quantities are deterministic and known.

A. Nominal AC-OPF

We consider a power network with the graph representation

$$\mathbb{G} = \{\mathcal{N}, \mathcal{L}\},$$

where $\mathcal{N} \doteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ denotes the set of buses (which can be represented as nodes of the graph), and $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{N}$ denotes the set of electrical lines connecting the different buses in the network (represented as edges of the graph). The set of conventional generator buses is denoted by $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, and its cardinality is n_g. As a convention, it is assumed that the buses indices are ordered so that the first n_g buses are generator buses, i.e. $\mathcal{G} \doteq \{1, 2, \dots, n_g\}$. Each generator (we assume for simplicity of notation that no more than one generator is present on each generator bus) connected to the bus $k \in \mathcal{G}$ provides complex power

$$P_k^G + Q_k^G \mathrm{i} \tag{1}$$

with P_k^G being the active power generated by the k-th generator, and Q_k^G the corresponding reactive power. Goal of the network manager is to guarantee that the output of generators is such that the network operates safely and, if possible, at minimal cost.

We now elaborate on the different constraints that should be satisfied in order for the network to operate safely. First, consider the line $(l, m) \in \mathcal{L}$, which is the line connecting buses l and m. Let y_{lm} be the (complex) admittance of the line and $V_k = |V_k| \angle \theta_k$ be the (complex) voltage at bus k, with magnitude $|V_k|$ and phase angle θ_k. Then, the following *Balance Equations* should be satisfied at all times

$$P_k^G - P_k^L = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_k} \mathrm{Re}\left\{V_k (V_k - V_l)^* y_{kl}^*\right\}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N} \tag{2a}$$

$$Q_k^G - Q_k^L = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_k} \mathrm{Im}\left\{V_k (V_k - V_l)^* y_{kl}^*\right\}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{2b}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_k$ is the set of all neighboring buses directly connected to bus k, and P_k^L and Q_k^L denote the (known) active and reactive loads of the network at the generator[1] bus k. Also, at generator bus $k \in \mathcal{G}$,

[1]Note that, by convention, P_k^G and Q_k^G are set to zero in nongenerator nodes.

one has the so-called *Power Constraints*, which restrict the active and reactive power. That is, given limits $P_{k\,\min}$, $P_{k\,\max}$ and $Q_{k\,\min}$, $Q_{k\,\max}$ the following inequalities should be satisfied:

$$P_{k\,\min} \leq P_k^G \leq P_{k\,\max}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{G} \tag{3a}$$

$$Q_{k\,\min} \leq Q_k^G \leq Q_{k\,\max}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{G}. \tag{3b}$$

Moreover, the voltages should satisfy the following *Voltage Constraints*

$$V_{k\,\min} \leq |V_k| \leq V_{k\,\max}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{4a}$$

$$|V_l - V_m| \leq \Delta V_{lm}^{\max}, \quad \forall (l,m) \in \mathcal{L} \tag{4b}$$

In [31], the constraints in (4b) have been proven to be practically equivalent to the more classical bounds

$$|V_l (V_l - V_m)^* y_{lm}^*| \leq S_{lm\,\max}, \quad \forall (l,m) \in \mathcal{L},$$

where $S_{lm\,\max}$ is the maximum apparent power flow which can path through the line $(l,m) \in \mathcal{L}$.

In the nominal optimal power flow problem, the goal is to minimize a sum of non-decreasing convex function f_k, $k \in \mathcal{G}$ subject to the constraints (2)–(4). The individual generation cost f_k is usually chosen as quadratic, and represents the cost of generation for generator k. Formally, the *Nominal AC-OPF Problem* can be stated as

Nominal AC-OPF

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{P_1^G \cdots P_{n_g}^G, Q_1^G \cdots Q_{n_g}^G, V_1 \cdots V_n}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \sum_{k \in \mathcal{G}} f_k(P_k^G) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \textit{Balance Equations } (2), \\ & \textit{Power Constraints } (3), \\ & \textit{Voltage Constraints } (4). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

We remark that problem (5) is a difficult optimization problem. Specifically, it is non-convex due to the nonlinear equations (2), which contain quadratic terms involving the voltages. For this reason, different simplifying assumptions have been introduced in the literature leading to computable approximations. Before discussing how these approximations are employed in this work, in the next section we make an important formal distinction between control and state variables.

B. Control and State Variables

The formulation of the nominal AC-OPF problem in (5) is very classical and can be traced back to the seminal paper of Carpentier [10]. The variables appearing in (5) are usually divided into two classes, depending on their role in the optimization problem. Indeed, already in [11], see also the recent survey [9], the distinction between control and state variables is explicitly made. As it is clear from their name, *control variables* are those used by the network operator to set the operating condition of the network or, in other words, to *control* its behavior. On the other hand, *state variables* are *dependent* variables that represent the state of a power network, and their values are a consequence of the designed control variables and of the constraints imposed to the power network.

In particular, control and state variables are defined differently depending on the type of bus. In a generator bus $k \in \mathcal{G}$, usually referred to as *PV bus* (see e.g. [33, Remark 1]) active power P_k^G of the generator and magnitude $|V_k|$ of the complex bus voltage represent the control variables, while phase angle θ_k of bus voltage and generator reactive power Q_k^G are the state variables. In a load bus, or *PQ bus*, the active and reactive power of the load P_k^L, Q_k^L are given (their values are known to the network operator) while magnitude and phase angle of bus voltage $|V_k|, \theta_k$ are state variables. A node to which both a generator and loads are connected is to be considered as a generator bus.

Remark 1 (Slack bus): In power flow studies, usually bus 0 is considered as *reference* or *slack* bus. The role of the slack bus is to balance the active and reactive power in the power grid. The slack bus must include a generator. The voltage magnitude and phase are fixed at the slack bus whereas, active and reactive generator power are variables. Therefore, in a slack bus there is no control variable, while active and reactive generator power P_k^G and Q_k^G are state variables. In this paper, for simplicity of notation, we do not include slack bus. We should note that our approach can be easily modified to capture the case where a slack bus is present in the network.

Remark 2 (Reactive power control): Although, for simplicity, in the formulation above we do not consider the possibility of reactive power being a control variable, this is not always the case. There are ways to control reactive power that can be deployed in a subset of the buses [39]. This can again be easily handled by our framework, but it is not done so as to provide a clearer exposition of our approach.

To emphasize the inherent difference between control and state variables, we introduce the notation

$$\mathbf{u} \doteq \{P_1^G \cdots P_{n_g}^G, |V_1| \cdots |V_{n_g}|\} \tag{6}$$

$$\mathbf{x} \doteq \{Q_1^G \cdots Q_{n_g}^G, |V_{n_g+1}|, \ldots, |V_n|, \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n\} \tag{7}$$

to denote respectively the control variables $\mathbf{u}$ and the state variables $\mathbf{x}$. This allows to reformulate the nominal OPF problem (5) in the following way, which is more suitable for the results to follow in this paper

Reformulation of the Nominal AC-OPF

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & f(\mathbf{u}) \\ \text{subject to:} \quad & \text{there exist } \mathbf{x} \text{ such that } g(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u}) = 0 \text{ and } h(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u}) \leq 0, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where $f \doteq \sum_{k\in\mathcal{G}} f_k(P_k^G)$, the equality constraint $g(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u}) = 0$ defines the balance equations (2), and the inequality constraint $h(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{u}) \leq 0$ summarize the power and voltage constraints (3) and (4).

The formulation presented in (8) has the following interpretation: given the loads in the load buses, optimally design $\mathbf{u}$ (active power of generators and voltage magnitude of generator nodes) such that *there exists* a network state $\mathbf{x}$ (reactive power and phase voltage at generator nodes $1, \ldots, n_g$, and complex voltage at load buses $n_{g+1}, \ldots, n$) satisfying the operational constraints presented in (2), (3), and (4).

C. Generation/Demand Uncertainty

The problem described in the previous subsections is an idealized one, where it is assumed that the demand on the network is completely predictable (and thus known in the design phase), and there is no uncertainty in the amount of power being generated at all generator nodes. However, as discussed in the Introduction, these assumptions are rather strong and cannot be applied when dealing with modern power networks with high penetration of renewable sources and variable demands. To address the challenges resulting from the existence of these significant sources of uncertainty, a reformulation of the problem of optimal power allocation is necessary. This is the main objective of this section.

Formally, in the framework considered in this paper, we assume both the existence of renewable sources and uncertain load. A renewable energy generator connected to bus $k \in \mathcal{N}$ provides an uncertain complex power

$$P_k^R(\delta_k^R) + Q_k^R(\delta_k^R)\mathrm{i} = P_k^{R,0} + Q_k^{R,0}\mathrm{i} + \delta_k^R, \tag{9}$$

with $P_k^{R,0} + Q_k^{R,0}\mathrm{i}$ being the nominal (predicted) power generated by the renewable energy source[2], and $\delta_k^R \in \mathbf{\Delta}_k^R \subset \mathbb{C}$ representing an uncertain complex fluctuation, which mainly depends on the environmental

[2]We use the convention that $P_k^R = 0$, $Q_k^R = 0$ if no renewable generator is connected to node k.

conditions, such as wind speed in the case of wind generators. Similarly, the uncertain demand in bus $k \in \mathcal{N}$ is represented as

$$P_k^L(\delta_k^L) + Q_k^L(\delta_k^L)\mathrm{i} = P_k^{L,0} + Q_k^{L,0}\mathrm{i} + \delta_k^L \tag{10}$$

where $P_k^{L,0}$ and $Q_k^{L,0}$ denote the expected active and reactive load and $\delta_k^L \in \mathbf{\Delta}_k^L \subset \mathbb{C}$ is the complex fluctuation in the demand at bus $k \in \mathcal{N}$. The support set is the point $\{0\}$ if no uncertainty (i.e. no renewable generator or variable load) is present in bus k. The probabilistic characterization of the uncertainties has been the subject of different studies, as discussed in Section V-A.

To simplify the notation, we collect the different sources of uncertainties by introducing the *uncertainty vector*

$$\boldsymbol{\delta} \doteq [\delta_1^L \ \cdots \ \delta_n^L \ \delta_1^R \ \cdots \ \delta_n^R]^T,$$

which varies in the set

$$\mathbf{\Delta} \doteq \mathbf{\Delta}_1^L \times \cdots \times \mathbf{\Delta}_n^L \times \mathbf{\Delta}_1^R \times \cdots \times \mathbf{\Delta}_n^R.$$

To deal in a rigorous way with the uncertainties introduced above, we adopt a modification of the so-called frequency control (primary and secondary control), similar to that discussed in [6] in the context of DC-OPF. In classical OPF, this approach is used to distribute to the generators the difference between real-time (actual) and predicted demand, through some coefficients which are generator specific. However, these coefficients are in general decided a priori in an ad-hoc fashion. This approach worked well in cases where the amount of power mismatch was not significant; however, once renewable generators are in the power network, this difference may become large, thus leading to line overloads in the network. The approach presented in [6] specifically incorporates these distribution parameters in the OPF optimization problem. In the setup proposed in this paper, we follow a similar strategy, and formally introduce a *deployment vector*

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} \doteq [\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{n_g}]^T,$$

with $\sum_{k\in\mathcal{G}} \alpha_k = 1$, $\alpha_k \geq 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{G}$, whose purpose is to distribute among the available generators the power mismatch created by the uncertain generators and loads.

To the best of our knowledge, the use of a deployment vector was originally introduced in the context of DC-approximations in [45] and [47], where it is referred to as "distribution vector," and physically represents the way the frequency control is affecting the generator power. In the above mentioned work, the vector was assumed to be constant, but the possibility of optimizing over it so as to achieve a better allocation of the generation resources (reserves) was already discussed. This was actually implemented by the same authors in [46] using also a more generic representation in the view of asymmetric reserves (different "distribution vector" for positive and negative power mismatch). More sophisticated formulations have been subsequently introduced. For instance, in [48] the generation-load mismatch is redistributed also to some of the loads.

During operation, the active generation output of each generator is modified according to the realizations of the uncertain loads and power (which are assumed to be measured on-line) as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{P}_k^G &= P_k^G + \alpha_k \left(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{N}} \mathrm{Re}\{\delta_j^L\} - \sum_{k\in\mathcal{R}} \mathrm{Re}\{\delta_k^R\} \right) \\ &= P_k^G + \alpha_k \mathbf{s}^T \mathrm{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}\}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{G} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

with $\mathbf{s}^T \doteq [\mathbf{1}_n^T, -\mathbf{1}_n^T]$. Note also that, with the introduction of the uncertain renewable energy generator and load into the power network, summarized by the vector $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, both *Balance Equations* (2) and *Power*

Generation Constraint (3) become uncertain. Hence, the equality constraints are rewritten as

$$P_k^G + \alpha_k \mathbf{s}^T \mathrm{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}\} + P_k^R(\boldsymbol{\delta}) - P_k^L(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_k} \mathrm{Re}\left\{V_k (V_k - V_l)^* y_{kl}^*\right\}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N} \tag{12a}$$

$$Q_k^G + Q_k^R(\boldsymbol{\delta}) - Q_k^L(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_k} \mathrm{Im}\left\{V_k (V_k - V_l)^* y_{kl}^*\right\}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}, \tag{12b}$$

$$\mathbf{1}^T \boldsymbol{\alpha} = 1 \tag{12c}$$

and the power inequality constraints become

$$P_{k\,\min} \leq P_k^G + \alpha_k \mathbf{s}^T \mathrm{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}\} \leq P_{k\,\max}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{G} \tag{13a}$$

$$Q_{k\,\min} \leq Q_k^G \leq Q_{k\,\max}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{G}, \tag{13b}$$

$$\alpha_k \geq 0, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{G}. \tag{13c}$$

Following the discussion in Section II-B, we note that the deployment vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ should also be considered as a control variable. Hence, the set of control variables is redefined as

$$\mathbf{u} \doteq \{P_1^G \cdots P_{n_g}^G, |V_1| \cdots |V_{n_g}|, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\}. \tag{14}$$

More importantly, it should be remarked that, with the introduction of the uncertainties, the value of the state variables will depend on the specific realization of the uncertainty. Indeed, for every value of $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, a different configuration of state variables may be necessary to satisfy the balance equation and other constraints. To emphasize this dependence on the uncertainty vector $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, we use the following notation

$$\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \doteq \{Q_1^G \cdots Q_{n_g}^G, |V_{n_g+1}|, \ldots, |V_n|, \theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n\}. \tag{15}$$

We are now ready to provide a formal statement of the *robust* version of the optimal power flow problem. To this end, denote by $g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) = 0$ the uncertain equality constraints collected in (12), and by $h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0$ the uncertain inequalities collected in (13).

Robust AC-OPF

$$\begin{aligned} \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & f(\mathbf{u}) \\ \text{subject to:} \quad & \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \boldsymbol{\Delta}, \text{ there exist } \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \text{ such that} \\ & \qquad g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) = 0 \text{ and } h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

In the above formulation of the robust OPF problem, originally introduced in [49], the objective is to optimize the values of the nominal generated power, the bus voltage magnitude at generator node and the deployment vector so that i) the network operates safely for all values of the uncertainty and ii) the generation cost of the network is minimized. In fact, if a solution to the problem above exists, we guarantee that for any admissible uncertainty, there exists a network state $\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ satisfying the operational constraints. Note that problem (16) is computationally very hard, since the uncertainty set $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$ is an infinite set (actually, uncountable). Hence, the optimization problem (16) is a nonlinear/nonconvex semi-infinite optimization problem. In the deterministic worst-case approach of (16) the constraints are enforced to hold for "all" possible values of the uncertain parameters. This is in many cases excessive, and leads to conservative results, with consequent degradation of the cost function (in our case, higher generation cost).

Hence, in the remainder of this paper, we follow a chance-constrained approach, in which a probabilistic description of the uncertainty is assumed, and a solution is sought which is valid for the entire set of uncertainty except for a (small) subset having probability measure smaller than a desired (small) risk level ε. This approach is suitable for problems where "occasional" violation of constraints can be tolerated. One can argue that this is the case in power networks, since violation of line flow constraints does not

necessarily lead to immediate line tripping. Rather, the line gradually heats up until a critical condition is reached and only then the line is disconnected. Therefore, if line overload happens with low probability, this will not lead to line tripping nor it will damage the network.

Formally, given a (small) risk level $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$, the chance constrained version of the optimal power flow problem can be stated as follows

Chance-constrained AC-OPF

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{\mathbf{u}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f(\mathbf{u}) \\ &\text{subject to:} \quad \Pr\left\{\exists \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \boldsymbol{\Delta} \text{ for which } \nexists\, \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \text{ such that } g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) = 0 \text{ and } h(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0\right\} \leq \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

Note that, in the above formulation, one accepts a certain *risk* that the proposed design $\mathbf{u}$ is such that some of the constraints are violated for some value of the uncertainty, but this probability of violation is bounded by the *a-priori* chosen violation level ε. Hence, one has a direct control on the risk of violating the constraints. We also remark that – from a numerical point of view – the above chance-constrained optimization problem is not tractable. On one hand, the original problem (16), which does not have probabilistic constraints, is, as mentioned before, non-convex due to presence of non-linear terms in the *Balance Equation* (12) and, on the other hand, the presence of probabilistic constraints in (17) requires the solution of hard multi-dimensional integration problems. To circumvent these numerical difficulties, in the next section we introduce an integrated solution approach that allows to i) relax the non-convex problem (16) to a convex one and ii) derive randomized algorithms for solving the chance constraint optimization problem.

III. Efficient Numerical Relaxation

In the next two subsections, we introduce the proposed numerical scheme for the solution of the AC-OPF problem in the presence of uncertainty. To this end, we first relax the non-convexity due to non-linear terms, and subsequently we use the scenario with certificates approach to solve the ensuing infinite dimensional convex optimization problem.

A. Approximation of Non-Convex Terms

In this subsection, we extend relaxation technique discussed in [5], [31] to the robust case circumventing the non-convexity associated with the optimal power flow problem (16). We stress that the only source of non-convexity of (16), and also of the original problem (5), is due to non-linear terms $V_k V_l$'s appearing in *Balance Equations* (2), (12) and *Voltage Constraints* (4). However, the quadratic constraints can be reformulated as linear ones by introducing a new variable $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^*$ where $\mathbf{V}$ is the vector of complex bus voltages $\mathbf{V} \doteq [V_1, \ldots, V_n]^T$. In order to replace $\mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^*$ with the new variable $\mathbf{W}$, two additional constraints need to be included: i) the matrix $\mathbf{W}$ needs to be positive semi definite, i.e. the following *Positivity Constraint* should hold

$$\mathbf{W} \succeq 0, \tag{18}$$

and ii) its rank should be one, i.e. the following *Rank Constraint* should hold

$$\text{rank}\{\mathbf{W}\} = 1. \tag{19}$$

An important observation is that, by introducing matrix $\mathbf{W}$, the only source of nonconvexity is captured by the rank constraint. Indeed, as shown first in [31] and subsequently in [37], in most cases this constraint can be dropped without affecting the OPF solution.

To formally define the *convexified version* of the Robust AC-OPF, we note that bus voltage $\mathbf{V}$ appears in *Voltage Constraints* (4) and *Balance Equations* (12). Therefore, these constraints are redefined in terms of the new variable $\mathbf{W}$ as

$$(V_{k\,\min})^2 \leq W_{kk} \leq (V_{k\,\max})^2, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N} \tag{20a}$$

$$W_{ll} + W_{mm} - W_{lm} - W_{ml} \leq (\Delta V_{lm}^{\max})^2, \quad \forall (l,m) \in \mathcal{L} \tag{20b}$$

and

$$P_k^G + \alpha_k \mathbf{s}^T \mathrm{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}\} + P_k^R(\boldsymbol{\delta}) - P_k^L(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_k} \mathrm{Re}\left\{(W_{kk} - W_{kl})^* y_{kl}^*\right\}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N} \tag{21a}$$

$$Q_k^G + Q_k^R(\boldsymbol{\delta}) - Q_k^L(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{N}_k} \mathrm{Im}\left\{(W_{kk} - W_{kl})^* y_{kl}^*\right\}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N} \tag{21b}$$

respectively. Recalling that the first n_g buses are generator buses and the remaining ones are load buses, we observe that the matrix $\mathbf{W}$ can be written as

$$\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{V}^* = \begin{bmatrix} |V_1|^2 & V_1V_2^* & \dots & V_1V_{n_g}^* & V_1V_{n_g+1}^* & \dots & V_1V_n^* \\ & |V_2|^2 & V_2V_3^* & \dots & V_2V_{n_g}^* & \dots & V_2V_n^* \\ & & \ddots & & & & \\ & & & |V_{n_g}|^2 & & & \\ & & & & |V_{n_g+1}|^2 & & \\ & & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & & |V_n|^2 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{22}$$

It is immediately noticed that some elements of $\mathbf{W}$ involve the control variables $|V_1|, \dots, |V_{n_g}|$ (specifically, the first n_g entries in the diagonal of $\mathbf{W}$), while others are dependent variables corresponding to the voltage magnitude $|V_{n_g+1}|, \dots, |V_n|$ at non-generator nodes, and the voltage phases $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n$. In order to distinguish between control and state variables appearing in it, we "decompose" $\mathbf{W}$ into the sum of two submatrices $\mathbf{W^u}$ and $\mathbf{W^x}$ as follows

$$\mathbf{W^u} \doteq \mathrm{diag}(|V_1|^2, \dots, |V_{n_g}|^2, 0, \dots) \tag{23}$$

$$\mathbf{W^x} \doteq \mathbf{W} - \mathbf{W^u}. \tag{24}$$

In this decomposition, we have a matrix $\mathbf{W^u}$ that includes the diagonal elements of $\mathbf{W}$ corresponding to the generator nodes only, while the remaining elements of $\mathbf{W}$ are collected in $\mathbf{W^x}$. With this in mind, the control and state variables are redefined as

$$\mathbf{u} \doteq \{\mathbf{P}^G, \boldsymbol{\alpha}, \mathbf{W^u}\} \tag{25}$$

and

$$\mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \doteq \{\mathbf{Q}^G, \mathbf{W^x}\} \tag{26}$$

respectively. With this notation settled, we are in the position to formally introduce the convexified version of the robust AC optimal power flow problem as follows

Convexified Robust AC-OPF (CR-AC-OPF)

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underset{\mathbf{P}^G,\boldsymbol{\alpha},\mathbf{W_u}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{k\in\mathcal{G}} f_k(P_k^G) \qquad (27)\\
&\text{subject to}\\
&\qquad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{\delta}\in\boldsymbol{\Delta}, \text{ there exist } \mathbf{Q}^G=\mathbf{Q}^G(\boldsymbol{\delta}), \mathbf{W^x}=\mathbf{W^x}(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \text{ such that}\\
&\qquad\quad \mathbf{W}=\mathbf{W^u}+\mathbf{W^x},\\
&\qquad\quad \mathbf{1}^T\boldsymbol{\alpha}=1,\\
&\qquad\quad P_k^G+\alpha_k\mathbf{s}^T\text{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}\}+P_k^R(\boldsymbol{\delta})-P_k^L(\boldsymbol{\delta})=\sum_{l\in\mathcal{N}_k}\text{Re}\left\{(W_{kk}-W_{kl})^*y_{kl}^*\right\},\ \forall k\in\mathcal{N}\\
&\qquad\quad Q_k^G+Q_k^R(\boldsymbol{\delta})-Q_k^L(\boldsymbol{\delta})=\sum_{l\in\mathcal{N}_k}\text{Im}\left\{(W_{kk}-W_{kl})^*y_{kl}^*\right\},\quad \forall k\in\mathcal{N}\\
&\qquad\quad P_{k\ \min}\le P_k^G+\alpha_k\mathbf{s}^T\text{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}\}\le P_{k\ \max},\quad \forall k\in\mathcal{G}\\
&\qquad\quad Q_{k\ \min}\le Q_k^G\le Q_{k\ \max},\quad \forall k\in\mathcal{G}\\
&\qquad\quad (V_{k\ \min})^2\le W_{kk}\le (V_{k\ \max})^2,\quad \forall k\in\mathcal{N}\\
&\qquad\quad W_{ll}+W_{mm}-W_{lm}-W_{ml}\le(\Delta V_{lm}^{\max})^2,\quad \forall(l,m)\in\mathcal{L}\\
&\qquad\quad \alpha_k\ge 0,\quad \forall k\in\mathcal{G}\\
&\qquad\quad \mathbf{W}\succeq 0
\end{aligned}$$

To the best of the authors knowledge, the formulation of the **CR-AC-OPF** is original, and it represents a contribution of the present paper. First, this approach clearly differs from the formulations based on a DC power flow set-up. Indeed, linearized approximations of the network may lead to erroneous results. Second, it improves upon the formulation based on convex AC-formulation in [44]. Indeed, in that work, the authors cope with the need of guaranteeing the existence of a different value of $\mathbf{W}$ for different values of the uncertainty $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ by imposing a specific dependence on $\mathbf{W}$ from the uncertainty. In our notation, [44] introduces the following finite (linear) parameterization

$$\mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\delta})=A+\sum_k B_k\boldsymbol{\delta}_k \qquad (28)$$

where $A, B_1,\dots,B_n$ become design variables in the optimization problem. With respect to this formulation, we remark the following:

i) the formulation is surely more conservative than the **CR-AC-OPF** one, since it imposes a *specific dependence* on $\mathbf{W}$, while we do not impose any a-priori form. This gain in terms of performance is shown in Section V.

ii) the parameterization in (28) requires modification of the voltage magnitude at the generators during operation. Indeed, as previously noted, $\mathbf{W}$ involves not only the state variables, but also the control variables corresponding to generator voltages $|V_1|,\dots,|V_{n_g}|$ which are not supposed to change during the operation. In the **CR-AC-OPF**, contrary, all control variables—including generators voltage magnitude—are designed during the optimization phase and do not need to be changed when demand/renewable power fluctuations occur.

Moreover, although the **CR-AC-OPF** formulation represents a relaxation of the robust optimal power flow problem, we can show that there are cases in which this relaxation is indeed exact. In particular, we introduce next a class of networks where **CR-AC-OPF** does provide the optimal solution to the Robust AC-OPF problem. To this end, we first briefly recall some concept from graph theory that are central for the results to follow. For a more detailed discussion on the following definitions and their interpretation in the context of power networks the reader is referred to [37].

Definition 1: A network/graph is called *weakly cyclic* if every edge belongs to at most one cycle.

Definition 2: A network is said to be *lossless* if

$$\mathrm{Re}\{y_{lm}\} = 0 \quad \forall (l,m) \in \mathcal{L}.$$

With these definitions at hand, we can now describe a class of networks for which the relaxed formulation above provides an exact solution. This theorem represents a natural extension of the results presented in [37] to the robust case.

Theorem 1: Consider a loseless weakly-cyclic network with cycles of size 3, and assume $Q_k^{\min} = -\infty$ for every $k \in \mathcal{G}$. Then, the convex relaxation **CR-AC-OPF** is exact.

Proof: Let $P^G_{k,opt}$ α_{opt} and $\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{u},opt}$ be achievers of the solution of **CR-AC-OPF**. Now, take any $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \boldsymbol{\Delta}$ and consider the following optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\mathbf{W}} \ & \sum_{k\in\mathcal{G}} Q_k \\
\text{s.t. } & P^G_{k,opt} + \alpha_{k,opt}\mathbf{s}^T\mathrm{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}\} \leq -P^R_k(\boldsymbol{\delta}) + P^L_k(\boldsymbol{\delta}) + \sum_{l\in\mathcal{N}_k} \mathrm{Re}\left\{(W_{kk} - W_{kl})^* y^*_{kl}\right\} \\
& \qquad \leq P^G_{k,opt} + \alpha_{k,opt}\mathbf{s}^T\mathrm{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}\}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N} \\
& Q_{k\ \min} \leq -Q^R_k(\boldsymbol{\delta}) + Q^L_k(\boldsymbol{\delta}) = \sum_{l\in\mathcal{N}_k} \mathrm{Im}\left\{(W_{kk} - W_{kl})^* y^*_{kl}\right\} \leq Q_{k\ \max}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N} \\
& (\mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{u}}_{opt})_{kk} \leq W_{kk} \leq (\mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{u}}_{opt})_{kk}, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{G}; \\
& (V_{k\ \min})^2 \leq W_{kk} \leq (V_{k\ \max})^2, \quad \forall k \in \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{G} \\
& W_{ll} + W_{mm} - W_{lm} - W_{ml} \leq (\Delta V^{\max}_{lm})^2, \quad \forall (l,m) \in \mathcal{L} \\
& \mathbf{W} \succeq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that, for the given value of the uncertainty, the solution of the optimization problem above has exactly the same generation cost as the solution of the **CR-AC-OPF**.

The optimization problem above is of the same form as the one used in the proof of part (a) of Theorem 2 in [37]. Hence, the same reasoning can be applied to show that there exists a rank one solution for the problem above.

Since, as mentioned before, the solution of the convex relaxation and the solution of the original optimal power flow problem coincide when $\mathrm{rank}(\mathbf{W}) = 1$, this implies that the values of control variables obtained using **CR-AC-OPF** are a feasible power allocation for any value of the uncertainty $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \boldsymbol{\Delta}$. Moreover, for all $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \boldsymbol{\Delta}$, the generation cost is equal to the optimal value of **CR-AC-OPF**.

This together with the fact that the solution of **CR-AC-OPF** is optimal for at least one $\boldsymbol{\delta}^* \in \boldsymbol{\Delta}$, leads to the conclusion that **CR-AC-OPF** does provide the best worst-case solution or, in other words, the robustly optimal power generation allocation. □

Theorem 1 is important because it shows that the exactness of the relaxation for a particular class of networks—proven for the nominal case in [37]—carries over to the robust formulation we introduced in (27). This shows that **CR-AC-OPF** represents indeed the right way to formulate the robust counterpart of the AC-OPF problem. We also remark that several results of the same spirit have been obtained in the literature for deterministic (no uncertainty) networks, see for instance [34]: we believe that these results can be extended to the convexified robust formulation introduced here. However, this goes beyond the scope of the present paper.

B. Penalized and robust costs

Note that, besides the numerous configurations where the relaxation has been proven to be exact, in the general case it is important to obtain solutions $\mathbf{W}$ with low rank. To this end, we adopt a penalization technique similar to that introduced in [36], [37]. More precisely, it is observed there that maximizing the weighted sum of off-diagonal entries of $\mathbf{W}$ often results in a low-rank solution.

To this end, one can augment the objective function with a weighted sum of generators' reactive power—for lossless network—and apparent power loss over the series impedance of some of the lines of the network (the so-called problematic lines $\mathcal{L}_{\text{prob}}$)—for lossy network—to increase the weighted sum of the real parts of off-diagonal elements of $\mathbf{W}$ and hence obtain a low rank solution. Formally, let $L_{lm} \doteq |S_{lm} + S_{ml}|$ denote the apparent power loss over the line (l, m) with $S_{lm} \doteq |(W_{ll} - W_{lm})^* y_{lm}^*|$. Given nonnegative factors γ_b and γ_ℓ, in [36], [37] the following penalized cost was considered

$$f_{\text{pen}}(\mathbf{P}^G, \mathbf{Q}^G, \mathbf{W}) \doteq \sum_{k\in\mathcal{G}} f_k(P_k^G) + \gamma_b \sum_{k\in\mathcal{G}} Q_k^G + \gamma_\ell \sum_{(l,m)\in\mathcal{L}_{\text{prob}}} L_{lm}.$$

Since, in the proposed approach, $\mathbf{Q}^G$ and $\mathbf{W}$ depend on the value of the uncertainty $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, the formulation of the robust optimal power flow problem needs to reflect this fact. More precisely, the right cost function to consider is

$$\max_{\boldsymbol{\delta}\in\boldsymbol{\Delta}} f_{\text{pen}}(\mathbf{P}^G, \mathbf{Q}^G, \mathbf{W}) \doteq \max_{\boldsymbol{\delta}\in\boldsymbol{\Delta}} \sum_{k\in\mathcal{G}} f_k(P_k^G) + \gamma_b \sum_{k\in\mathcal{G}} Q_k^G + \gamma_\ell \sum_{(l,m)\in\mathcal{L}_{\text{prob}}} L_{lm}.$$

The constraints remain the same as in (27). This modification of the cost provides a way of "encouraging" low rank solutions and it has been shown to work well in practice.

IV. A RANDOMIZED APPROACH TO **CR-AC-OPF**

In this section, we first briefly summarize the main features of the scenario with certificates problem, and then show how this approach can be used to tackle in an efficient way the **CR-AC-OPF** problem introduced in the previous section.

A. Scenario with Certificates

In [24] the design with certificates approach was introduced, in which a clear distinction is made between *design* variables x and *certificates* ξ. In particular, in scenario with certificates (SwC) the function $f(\theta, \xi, \boldsymbol{\delta})$ is jointly convex in θ and ξ for given $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \boldsymbol{\Delta}$. Then, the following *robust optimization problem with certificates* is introduced

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta} \quad & c^T\theta \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \forall \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \boldsymbol{\Delta}\ \exists \xi = \xi(\boldsymbol{\delta}) \text{ satisfying } f(\theta, \xi, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Then, it is shown that problem (29) can be approximated by introducing the following *scenario optimization with certificates* problem, based on the extraction of N random samples $\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(N)}$ of the uncertainty,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{\text{SwC}} = \arg \min_{x,\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_N} \quad & c^T\theta \\ \text{subject to} \quad & f(\theta, \xi_i, \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) \leq 0,\ i = 1, \ldots, N. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Note that in SwC *a new certificate variable ξ_i is created for every sample $\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}$*. In this way, one implicitly constructs an "uncertainty dependent" certificate, without assuming any a-priori explicit functional dependence on $\boldsymbol{\delta}$.

To present the properties of the solution θ_{SwC}, we first introduce the violation probability of a given design θ as follows

$$\text{Viol}(\theta) = \Pr\Big\{\exists \boldsymbol{\delta} \in \boldsymbol{\Delta} | \nexists \xi \text{ satisfying } f(\theta, \xi, \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0\Big\}.$$

Then, the main result regarding the scenario optimization with certificates is recalled next.

Theorem 2: Assume that, for any multisample extraction, problem (30) is feasible and attains a unique optimal solution. Then, given an accuracy level $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and a confidence level $\beta \in (0,1)$, if the number of samples is chosen as

$$N \geq N_{\mathrm{SwC}} = \frac{\mathrm{e}}{\varepsilon(\mathrm{e}-1)}\left(\ln\frac{1}{\beta} + n_\theta - 1\right) \tag{31}$$

where n_θ is the dimension of θ, and e is the Euler number. Then, with probability at least $1-\beta$, the solution θ_{SwC} of problem (30) satisfies

$$\mathrm{Viol}(\theta_{\mathrm{SwC}}) \leq \varepsilon.$$

Note that, in the above theorem, we guaranteed with high confidence $(1-\beta)$ that the solution returned by the SwC has a risk of violation of constraints less than the predefined (small) risk level ε.

*B. SwC Solution to **CR-AC-OPF***

Clearly, problem **CR-AC-OPF** represents a robust optimization problem with certificates, in which the design variables are those "controllable" by the network manager, i.e. $\theta \equiv \mathbf{u}$ while the certificates represent the quantities that can be "adjusted" to guarantee constraint satisfaction, i.e. $\xi \equiv \mathbf{x}_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$. Based on this consideration, in this paper we propose the following solution strategy to the **CR-AC-OPF** problem:

SwC-AC-OPF Design Procedure

i) Given probabilistic levels ε, and β compute N_{SwC} according to (31).
ii) Generate $N \geq N_{\mathrm{SwC}}$ sampled scenarios $\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(1)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(N)}$, where the uncertainty is drawn according to its known probability density.
iii) Solve the convex optimization problem **SwC-AC-OPF** stated in (33), which returns the control variables $\mathbf{P}^G, \mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{u}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha}$.
iv) During operation, measure uncertainty in generations and loads $\boldsymbol{\delta}$, and accommodate the k-th controllable generator as follows

$$\bar{P}_k^G = P_k^G + \alpha_k \mathbf{s}^T \mathrm{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}\},\ k \in \mathcal{G} \tag{32a}$$

$$|V_k| = \sqrt{W_{kk}},\ k \in \mathcal{G}. \tag{32b}$$

SwC-AC-OPF

$$
\begin{aligned}
\underset{\substack{\mathbf{P}^G,\mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{u}},\boldsymbol{\alpha},\\ \mathbf{Q}^{G,[1]},\ldots,\mathbf{Q}^{G,[N]},\\ \mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{x},[1]},\ldots,\mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{x},[N]}}}{\text{minimize}} \quad & \gamma \qquad (33)\\
\text{subject to} \quad & \text{for } i=1,\ldots,N\\
& \mathbf{W}^{[i]} = \mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{u}} + \mathbf{W}^{\mathbf{x},[i]}\\
& L_{lm}^{[i]} = |(W_{ll}^{[i]} - W_{lm}^{[i]})^* y_{lm}^*| + |(W_{mm}^{[i]} - W_{ml}^{[i]})^* y_{lm}^*|\\
& \sum_{k\in\mathcal{G}} f_k(P_k^G) + \gamma_b \sum_{k\in\mathcal{G}} Q_k^{G,[i]} + \gamma_\ell \sum_{(l,m)\in\mathcal{L}^{\text{prob}}} L_{lm}^{[i]} \leq \gamma\\
& P_k^G + \alpha_k \mathbf{s}^T \text{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}\} + P_k^R(\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - P_k^L(\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) = \sum_{l\in\mathcal{N}_k} \text{Re}\left\{(W_{kk}^{[i]} - W_{kl}^{[i]})^* y_{kl}^*\right\}, \quad \forall k\in\mathcal{N}\\
& Q_k^{G,[i]} + Q_k^R(\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) - Q_k^L(\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}) = \sum_{l\in\mathcal{N}_k} \text{Im}\left\{(W_{kk}^{[i]} - W_{kl}^{[i]})^* y_{kl}^*\right\}, \quad \forall k\in\mathcal{N}\\
& P_{k\,\min} \leq P_k^G + \alpha_k \mathbf{s}^T \text{Re}\{\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(i)}\} \leq P_{k\,\max}, \quad \forall k\in\mathcal{G}\\
& Q_{k\,\min} \leq Q_k^{G,[i]} \leq Q_{k\,\max}, \quad \forall k\in\mathcal{G}\\
& (V_{k\,\min})^2 \leq W_{kk}^{[i]} \leq (V_{k\,\max})^2, \quad \forall k\in\mathcal{N}\\
& W_{ll}^{[i]} + W_{mm}^{[i]} - W_{lm}^{[i]} - W_{ml}^{[i]} \leq (\Delta V_{lm}^{\max})^2, \quad \forall (l,m)\in\mathcal{L}\\
& \alpha_k \geq 0, \quad \forall k\in\mathcal{G}\\
& \mathbf{W}^{[i]} \succeq 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

We remark that Theorem 2 guarantees that the **SwC-AC-OPF** design procedure is such that the probabilistic constraints of the Chance-Constrained AC-OPF (17) are satisfied with very high confidence $(1-\beta)$. In other words, one has an *a-priori* guarantee that the risk of violating the constrains is bounded, and one can accurately bound this violation level by choosing the probabilistic parameters ε, β. The above described procedure represents the main result of this paper. In Section V, we demonstrate how this procedure outperforms existing ones in terms of guarantees of lower line-violations.

C. Handling Security Constraints

An important observation is that the approach introduced in this paper can be readily extended to handle security constraint. In particular, the popular $N-1$ security requirements discussed, for instance, in [44] can be directly included in the robust optimization problem (16), and in its subsequent derivations.

We recall that, in the $N-1$ security constrained OPF framework, only the outages of *a single component* are taken into account. A list of N_{out} possible outages, $\mathcal{I}^{\text{out}} = \{0, 1, \ldots, N_{\text{out}}\}$, is formed (with 0 corresponding to the case of no outages). Then, a large optimization problem is constructed, with N_{out} instances of the constraints, where the i-th instance corresponds to removing the i-th component form the equations, with $i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{out}}$. The exact same approach can be replicated here.

However, we remark that the SwC formulation allows for a more precise and realistic handling of the possible outages. Indeed, we note that in a real network some buses may have a larger probability of incurring into an outage, for instance because they are located in a specific geographical position, or because they employ older technologies. To reflect this scenario, we associate to each element $i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{out}}$ in the network a given *probability of outage*

$$p_i^{\text{out}} \in [0, 1],$$

which can be different for each component, and is supposed to be known to the network manager. Large values of p_i correspond to large probability of an outage occurring in the i-th component. Then, in our



Fig. 2: Modified New England 39 bus system. Renewable generators are connected to nodes 5, 6, 14 and 17.

framework, outages can be treated in the same way as uncertainties. Formally, we can associate to each component a random variable δ_i^{out}, $i \in \mathcal{I}^{\text{out}}$, with Bernoulli density with mean $1-p_i^{\text{out}}$. Then, the scenario with certificates design is applied considering the extended uncertainty $\left\{\boldsymbol{\delta}, \boldsymbol{\delta}^{\text{out}}\right\}$.

In practice, when constructing the **SwC-AC-OPF** problem, for each sampling instance the i-th component is removed with probability p_i^{out}. It is important to note that this approach goes beyond the standard $N-1$ security constrained setup, since: i) *multiple* simultaneous outages are automatically taken into account, ii) it allows weighting differently the different component.

V. Numerical Examples

In order to examine the effectiveness of the proposed method, we perform extensive simulations using New England 39-bus system case adopted form [51]. The network has 39 buses, 46 lines and 10 conventional generation units, and it is modified to include 4 wind generators connected to buses 5, 6, 14 and 17 as shown in Figure 2. The renewable energy generators and all loads connected to different buses are considered to be uncertain. In total, there are 46 uncertain parameters in the network. The goal is to design active power and voltage amplitude of all controllable generators as well as the distribution vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ such that the generation cost is minimized while all the constraint of the network i.e. line flow, bus voltage and generators output constraint are respected with high probability.

A. Distribution of the Uncertainty

The choice of forecast error distribution significantly affects the obtained solution in terms of robustness and generation cost. In the case of wind generation, the forecast error distribution is often assumed to be Gaussian [12], [19], [40] but, as shown in [27] this assumption poorly represents the actual distribution. In particular, the actual error distribution – for wind generator and load – has heavier tail than Gaussian and is leptokurtic [25], [26]. For this reason, we adopt Pearson system [41] to represent the error in renewable generation and load. Pearson system is represented by the mean μ (first moment), variance σ^2 (second moment), skewness γ (third moment) and kurtosis κ (forth moment), making it suitable to represent leptokurtic distributions. Pearson system consists of seven type of distributions: Type I to VII. Some well known distributions such as Beta, Gamma, Inverse Gamma and Student's t distribution belong to the Pearson system. In the particular case of Gaussian distribution, skewness and kurtosis are 0 and 3 respectively. Increasing kurtosis to more then 3 leads to a leptokurtic distribution with heavier tail than Gaussian. This helps capturing large forecast errors more effectively than Gaussian. Extreme errors in the forecast which is ignored by Gaussian distribution can produce large impact on the performance of power network.

We highlight that solving a chance constrained optimization problem where uncertain parameters have an arbitrary probability density function is very difficult (if not impossible) in classical optimization methods. Contrary, when adopting a randomized setup, it simply amounts to generating a set of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) random samples form the set of uncertainty for which there are efficient numerical tools.

B. Numerical Results

We use the methodology presented in Section IV to solve the robust optimal power flow problem for New England 39 bus system. We consider a 24 hour demand pattern shown in Figure 3-(a) and solve the optimal power flow problem for each hour by minimizing the nominal cost. The error probability distribution for wind generator and load is chosen based on Pearson system with $\sigma = 0.2 \times$(predicted value), $\gamma = 0$, $\kappa = 3.5$ leading to a leptokurtic distribution with heavier tail than Gaussian. The selected probabilistic accuracy and confidence levels ε and δ are 0.05 and 1×10^{-10} respectively resulting in $5,862$ number of scenario samples. We note that the number of design variables n_θ is 204 in our formulation. The penetration level is chosen to be 30%. The penetration level indicates how much of the total demand is provided by the wind generators. For instance a 30% penetration level means that, in total, the wind generators provide 30% of the nominal load. We also assume that each renewable energy generator contributes equally to provide this power. The optimization problem is formulated and then solved using YALMIP [32] and Mosek [3] respectively.

In order to examine robustness of the obtained solutions, we run an *a-posteriori* analysis based on Monte Carlo simulation. To this end, we generate $10,000$ random samples from the uncertainty set—corresponding to uncertain active and reactive generated wind power and load—and for each sample, modify the network to include wind power generators, replace the load vector by its uncertain counterpart, compute the power mismatch, distribute the mismatch to all conventional generators by using (11) and solve the power flow problem using `runpf` command of MATPOWER [51] to derive line flows. The empirical violation of line flows is computed by counting the number of times each line exceeds its limit in the Monte Carlo simulation and dividing this value by $10,000$. Figure 3-(c) shows the 24 hour empirical violation of line flow for all lines of the network. The mean value of generation cost associated with the 24 hour demand is also shown in Figure 3-(b). We note that this graph is obtained by averaging the generation cost over all $10,000$ samples.

In Figure 4, we compare line loading percentage for scenario with certificates approach against standard optimal power flow design where no uncertainty is taken into account. Demand level in Figure 4 is $6,406$MVA. This proves the necessity of adopting a robust strategy for the new power grids containing renewable power generators. In such a network if we rely on the classical OPF design where no uncertainty



(a)



(b)



(c)

Fig. 3: (a): 24 hours demand pattern. (b): Average generation cost computed in the posteriori analysis based on Monte Carlo simulation. (c): 24 hours empirical violation of line flow computed in the posteriori analysis based on Monte Carlo simulation.

is taken into account in designing the control variables, it results in very frequent overloads—as shown in Figure 4-(b)—and hence frequent line tripping or even cascading outage. On the other hand, the robust strategy presented in the current paper successfully designs the control variables such that only very occasional violation happens during the operation of the network in the presence of large number of uncertain parameters.

We also compare the proposed strategy against the one presented in [44]. In this comparison, we only consider uncertainty in renewable energy generators. Loads are considered to be known exactly. This is because [44] can only handle uncertainty in renewable energy generator. In [44], the number of design variables appearing in the optimization problem is much larger than SwC approach. This is due to the linear parametrization (28) where some additional design variables are introduced. Since the number of



(a) (b)

Fig. 4: Line loading percentage for $10,000$ random samples extracted from the uncertainty set. Figure (a) reports the results of scenario with certificates approach. In Figure (b), the solution to standard optimal power flow design is used where no uncertainty is taken into account in its design.
In the boxplots, the red line represents the median value, edges of each box correspond to the 25^{th} and 75^{th} percentiles, whereas the whiskers extend to 99% coverage. The magenta marks denote the data outliers.



Fig. 5: The probability of line flow violation compared with [44]. The number of scenario samples for SwC is $2,931$ while [44] requires $11,838$ samples.

scenario samples (31) depends on the number of design variables (n_θ), the additional design variables lead to significant growth in the number of design variables as compared to SwC approach. The worst-case cost is minimized in the OPF formulation—see subsection III-B. The penetration level is assumed to be 35% and demand level is $7,112$ MVA corresponding to the peak demand in Figure 3. Choosing $\varepsilon = 0.1,\ \delta = 1 \times 10^{-10}$, the number of scenario samples for [44] is $11,838$—with 896 design variables—and for scenario with certificates is $2,931$—with 204 design variables. Large number of scenario samples associated with the approach presented in [44] results in much higher computational cost compared to SwC approach. Indeed, the optimization problem formulated based on [44] takes more than 51 hours to be solved on a workstation with 12 cores and 48 GB of RAM, while the solution of the SwC approach



(a) (b)

Fig. 6: Line loading percentage for $10,000$ random samples extracted from the uncertainty set. Figure (a) reports the results of scenario with certificates approach. Figure (b) reports the results of the approach presented in [44]. In the boxplots, the red line represents the median value, edges of each box correspond to the 25^{th} and 75^{th} percentiles, whereas the whiskers extend to 99% coverage. The magenta marks denote the data outliers.

takes less than 4 hours. We remark that the computational time refers to a non-optimized implementation of the problem. Also, sequential techniques as those proposed in [13] may be adopted to significantly reduce computation times.

We also run an *a-posteriori* analysis based on Monte Carlo simulation to estimate the probability of line flow violation. In the posteriori analysis we use exactly the same set of samples—different from the design samples of course—to evaluate performance of the two approaches. Figure 5 compares the probability of line flow violation for the two approaches. The line loading percentage is also compared in a boxplot in Figure 6. This comparison shows that the linear parameterization (28) is conservative leading to larger violation level compared to SwC approach.

VI. Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we proposed a novel approach to the optimal power flow problem in the presence of uncertain renewable energy sources and uncertain load. Assuming that the probability distribution of the uncertainty is available, we aim at optimizing the nominal power generation subject to a small well defined risk of violating generation and transmission constraints. To solve this complex NP-hard problem, we propose a randomized algorithm based on the novel concept of scenario with certificates and on convex relaxations of power flow problems. The effectiveness of the proposed approach is illustrated via numerical examples where it is shown that one can significantly decrease the probability of constraint violation without a significant impact on the nominal power generation cost.

VII. Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Prof. Mohammad Rasouli for the very insightful comments and suggestions that greatly helped in improving this manuscript.

References

[1] MA. Abido. Optimal power flow using particle swarm optimization. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 24(7):563–571, 2002.

[2] O. Alsac, J Bright, M Prais, and B Stot. Further developments in lp-based optimal power flow. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 5(3):697–711, 1990.

[3] E. Andersen and K. Andersen. The mosek interior point optimizer for linear programming: an implementation of the homogeneous algorithm. In *High performance optimization*, pages 197–232. Springer, 2000.

[4] X. Bai and H. Wei. A semidefinite programming method with graph partitioning technique for optimal power flow problems. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 33(7):1309–1314, 2011.

[5] X. Bai, H. Wei, K. Fujisawa, and Y. Wang. Semidefinite programming for optimal power flow problems. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 30(6-7):383 – 392, 2008.

[6] D. Bienstock, M. Chertkov, and S. Harnett. Chance-constrained optimal power flow: risk-aware network control under uncertainty. *SIAM Review*, 56(3):461–495, 2014.

[7] B. Borkowska. Probabilistic load flow. *IEEE Transactions on Power Apparatus and Systems*, 93(3):752–759, 1974.

[8] M. B. Cain, R. P. O'Neill, and A. Castillo. History of optimal power flow and formulations (opf paper 1). Technical report, US Federal Energy Resource Commission (FERC), December 2012.

[9] F. Capitanescu. Critical review of recent advances and further developments needed in {AC} optimal power flow. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 136:57–68, 2016.

[10] J. Carpentier. Contribution a l'étude du dispatching économique. *Bull. Soc. Francaise des Electriciens*, 3:431–447, 1962.

[11] J. Carpentier. Optimal power flows. *Int. Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, 1(1):3–15, 1979.

[12] E. Castronuovo and J. Lopes. On the optimization of the daily operation of a wind-hydro power plant. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 19:1599–1606, 2004.

[13] M. Chamanbaz, F. Dabbene, R. Tempo, V. Venkataramanan, and Q. G. Wang. Sequential randomized algorithms for convex optimization in the presence of uncertainty. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 61:2565–2571, 2016.

[14] C. Coffrin and P. Van Hentenryck. A linear-programming approximation of ac power flows. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 26(4):718–734, 2014.

[15] European Commission. Strategic energy technology plan (set-plan). *http://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/technology-and-innovation/strategic-energy-technology-plan*, 2016.

[16] A. J. Conejo, M. Carrión, and J. M. Morales. *Decision making under uncertainty in electricity markets*, volume 1. Springer, 2010.

[17] Global Wind Energy Council. Global wind statistics 2015. *http://www.gwec.net/wp-content/uploads/vip/GWEC-PRstats-2015_LR.pdf*, 2016.

[18] Energy Efficiency Department of Energy (DOE) and Renewable Energy. 20% of wind energy by 2030: Increasing wind energy's contribution to u.s. electricity supply. *DOE/GO-102008-2567*, 2008.

[19] R. Doherty and M. Malley. A new approach to quantify reserve demand in systems with significant installed wind capacity. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 20:587–595, 2005.

[20] H.W. Dommel and W.F. Tinney. Optimal power flow solutions. *IEEE transactions on power apparatus and systems*, 10:1866–1876, 1968.

[21] M. Farivar and S. H. Low H. Low. Branch flow model: relaxations and convexification (Parts I, II). *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 28(3):2554–2572, 2013.

[22] Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Order no. 890. *http://www.ferc.gov/whats-new/comm-meet/2007/021507/E-1.pdfhttp://www.ferc.gov/whats-new/comm-meet/2007/021507/E-1.pdf*, 2007.

[23] Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Order no. 764. *http://www.ferc.gov/whats-new/comm-meet/2012/062112/E-3.pdf*, 2012.

[24] S. Formentin, F. Dabbene, R. Tempo, L. Zaccarian, and S. M. Savaresi. Scenario optimization with certificates and applications to anti-windup design. In *Proc. IEEE 53rd Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 2810–2815, 2014.

[25] B. Hodge, D. Lew, and M. Milligan. Short-term load forecast error distributions and implications for renewable integration studies. In *Proc. IEEE Green Technologies Conference*, pages 435–442. IEEE, 2013.

[26] B. Hodge, D. Lew, M. Milligan, H. Holttinen, S. Sillanpää, E. Gómez-Lázaro, R. Scharff, L. Söder, X. G. Larsén, G. Giebel, D. Flynn, and J. Dobschinski. Wind Power Forecasting Error Distributions : An International Comparison. In *Proc. 11th Annual International Workshop on Large-Scale Integration of Wind Power into Power Systems as well as on Transmission Networks for Offshore Wind Power Plants Conference*, 2012.

[27] B. Hodge and M. Milligan. Wind power forecasting error distributions over multiple timescales. In *Power and Energy Society General Meeting, 2011 IEEE*, pages 1–8, 2011.

[28] R. A. Jabr. Exploiting sparsity in SDP relaxations of the OPF problem. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 27(2):1138–1139, 2012.

[29] R.A. Jabr. Radial distribution load flow using conic programming. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 21(3):1458–1459, 2006.

[30] L.L. Lai, J.T. Ma, R. Yokoyama, and M. Zhao. Improved genetic algorithms for optimal power flow under both normal and contingent operation states. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 19(5):287–292, 1997.

[31] J. Lavaei and S. H. Low. Zero duality gap in optimal power flow problem. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 27(1):92–107, Feb 2012.

[32] J. Lofberg. Yalmip: A toolbox for modeling and optimization in MATLAB. In *Proc. IEEE International Symposium on Computer Aided Control Systems Design*, pages 284–289. IEEE, 2004.

[33] S. H. Low. Convex relaxation of optimal power flow; Part I: formulations and equivalence. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 1(1):15–27, March 2014.

[34] S. H. Low. Convex relaxation of optimal power flow; Part II: exactness. *IEEE Transactions on Control of Network Systems*, 1(2):177–189, June 2014.

[35] S. Backhaus M. Lubin, Y. Dvorkin. A robust approach to chance constrained optimal power flow with renewable generation. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, to appear(doi: 10.1109/TPWRS.2015.2499753), 2016.

[36] R. Madani, M. Ashraphijuo, and J. Lavaei. Promises of conic relaxation for contingency-constrained optimal power flow problem. In *Proc. of 52nd Annual Allerton Conference on Communication, Control, and Computing*, pages 1064–1071, 2014.

[37] Ramtin Madani, Samira Sojoudi, and Javad Lavaei. Convex relaxation for optimal power flow problem: Mesh networks. *Power Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, 30(1):199–211, 2015.

[38] J. A Momoh and J.Z. Zhu. Improved interior point method for opf problems. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 14(3):1114–1120, 1999.

[39] K.R. Padiyar. *FACTS Controllers in Power Transmission and Distribution*. Anshan, 2009.

[40] V. Pappala, I. Erlich, K. Rohrig, and J. Dobschinski. A stochastic model for the optimal operation of a wind-thermal power system. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 24:940–950, 2009.

[41] K. Pearson. Contributions to the mathematical theory of evolution. ii. skew variation in homogeneous material. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. A*, pages 343–414, 1895.

[42] EWEA position paper. 2050: Facilitating 50% wind energy - recommendations on transmission infrastructure, system operation and electricity market integration. Technical report, EWEA European Wind Energy Association, 2009.

[43] B. Stott, J. Jardim, and O. Alsac. Dc power flow revisited. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 24(3):1290–1300, 2009.

[44] M. Vrakopoulou, M. Katsampani, K. Margellos, J. Lygeros, and G. Andersson. Probabilistic security-constrained AC optimal power flow. In *Proc. PowerTech (POWERTECH), IEEE Grenoble*, pages 1–6, 2013.

[45] M. Vrakopoulou, K. Margellos, J. Lygeros, and G. Andersson. Probabilistic guarantees for the $n-1$ security of systems with wind power generation. In *Proceedings of PMAPS*, 2012.

[46] M. Vrakopoulou, K. Margellos, J. Lygeros, and G. Andersson. A probabilistic framework for reserve scheduling and $n-1$ security assessment of systems with high wind power penetration. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 28(4):3885–3896, 2013.

[47] M. Vrakopoulou, K. Margellos, J. Lygeros, and G. Andersson. Probabilistic guarantees for the $n-1$ security of systems with wind power generation. In R. Billinton, R. Karki, and K.A. Verma, editors, *Reliability and Risk Evaluation of Wind Integrated Power Systems*, pages 59–73. Springer, 2013.

[48] M. Vrakopoulou, J.L. Mathieu, and G. Andersson. Stochastic optimal power flow with uncertain reserves from demand response. In *47th Hawaii International Conference on System Science*, 2014.

[49] T. Wada, R. Morita, T. Asai, I. Masubuchi, and Y. Fujisaki. Randomized solution for robust optimal power flow. In *Proc. IEEE 53rd Annual Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, pages 5195–5200, Dec 2014.

[50] X. Yan and V.H. Quintana. Improving an interior-point-based opf by dynamic adjustments of step sizes and tolerances. *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems*, 14(2):709–717, 1999.

[51] R. Zimmerman, C. Murillo-Sánchez, and R. Thomas. Matpower: Steady-state operations, planning, and analysis tools for power systems research and education. *Power Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, 26(1):12–19, 2011.